

REMARKS

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-20 have been examined, while claims 21-62 have been withdrawn as being directed to non-elected subject matter and have subsequently been canceled without prejudice in the present amendment. Claims 63-65 have been added by way of this amendment.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's careful examination and favorable treatment of the claims in which claims 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 16, and 19-20 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowable if properly rewritten.

Claims 1, 4, 9, 11-12 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. With respect to claims 1, 4, 9, 11-12 and 15, the Examiner contends that the expression "field lens portion" renders the claims vague and indefinite. Applicants have amended claims 1, 4, 9, 11-12, and 15 to replace the expression "field lens portion" with the expression "lens portion proximate the image plane". No new matter is being introduced by this amendment since antecedent support is present throughout the specification and the drawing figures and in particular, paragraph [0006] of the printed publication of the present application and in the figures 1, 5, 8, 10 and 12.

The Examiner also contends that the wording of claim 11 is vague and indefinite. Applicants have amended claim 11 and respectfully submit that it is clear from the claim that the deflecting mirror is disposed between the spaced intermediate portion and the lens portion that is proximate the image plane. This amendment is based on the disclosure of paragraph [0098] of the printed publication of the present application and Fig. 2. Reconsideration and allowance of this claim is respectfully requested.

Claim 10 has been objected to based on the reasons set forth in the Office Action. Applicants have amended claim 10 as per the Examiner's suggestion and therefore, this objection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-2, 6-7, 11-13 and 17-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakagiri.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the feature of original claim 4, namely, that the lens portion proximate the image plane (e.g., lens portion 300 in Fig. 1) includes a collecting lens and a divergent lens. In addition, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the lens portion proximate the image plane is in a region where the absolute ray height of the outermost chief ray exceeds the absolute ray height of the marginal ray at the lens surfaces. In other words, claim 1 has been amended to recite the specific location of the lens portion proximate the image plane. No new matter is being introduced since this amendment is supported by the specification. For example, paragraph [0006] of the printed publication of the present application discloses the added features.

Applicants respectfully submit that based on the Examiner's indication that claim 4 contains allowable subject matter, amended claim 1, which includes original claim 4, should therefore be allowed since amended claim 1 recites an objective that is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited reference.

Based on the foregoing, consideration and allowance of amended claim 1 are earnestly solicited.

Claims 2, 3 and 5-11 should be allowed as depending from what should be an allowed independent claim 1, as amended.

Claim 12 has been amended in a manner similar to how claim 1 has been amended and therefore, based on the same reasons discussed above as to why claim 1 should be allowed, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 12, as amended, should be allowed. Reconsideration and allowance of amended claim 12 are earnestly solicited.

Claims 13, 14 and 16-20 should be allowed as depending from what should be an allowed independent claim 12, as amended.

New claim 63 should be allowed based on the fact that the prior art reference does not disclose or suggest an objective that has a lens portion proximate the image plane and more particularly, in the location that has been added in claim 63, i.e., a region along the optical axis in which for a selected position along the optical axis, the absolute distance of the outermost chief ray to the optical axis exceeds the absolute distance of the marginal ray to the optical axis. Also, claim 63 recites that the outermost chief ray passes the objective through the optical axis proximate the aperture plane at a maximum angle to the optical axis, striking an edge of an image field in the image plane, and starting from an edge of an object field in the object plane, with the edge of the object field being optically conjugated to the edge of the image field. Consideration and allowance of claim 63 are earnestly solicited.

New claim 64 should be allowed not only for at least some of the above reasons but also based on the fact that none of the cited art discloses or even suggests an objective of this type where there is only one “field lens” with two aspherical surfaces. Consideration and allowance of claim 64 are earnestly solicited.

Claim 65 has been added by way of this amendment and presents the subject matter of original claims 1 and 4 and based on the Examiner’s comments that original claim 4 contains allowable subject matter, claim 65 should be allowed.

Application No. 10/735,172
Amendment dated October 14, 2005
Reply to Office Action of May 16, 2005

Docket No.: 01641/1200440-US2

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: October 18, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Edward J. Ellis

Registration No.: 40,389
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 5257
New York, New York 10150-5257
(212) 527-7700
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant